

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed August 26, 2005, claims 21, 26, 31, and 36 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Therefore, claims 21-40 are pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is requested.

Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

Applicants hereby acknowledge receipt of initialed and signed copies of PTO-1449 forms corresponding to IDSs filed February 9, 2005, and June 10, 2005, which indicate that the Examiner has considered all of the references provided therein.

Double Patenting

Claims 21-40 stand provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 33-64 of copending Application No. 09/885,139. Applicants will consider filing a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome this rejection after the claims have been determined to otherwise be in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 21-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,826,554 to Sone ("Sone"). Applicants traverse this rejection on the grounds that Sone does not disclose all of the features of the claimed invention.

Claims 21, 26, 31, and 36 all recite a mobile wireless client device. The Examiner asserts that the interrogator unit (22) of Sone corresponds to this claim feature. See the 8/26/2005 Office Action at page 4. However, the interrogator unit of Sone is neither mobile, nor wireless. See Sone at col. 5, lines 30-35 (teaching the

interrogator unit is “mounted” or “affixed” to one location); and at col. 11, lines 11-14 (teaching the interrogator unit is attached to the store’s computer system via the system bus (a wired connection)).

Additionally, claim 21 recites, among other things, formatting the content according to the mobile design element and transmitting the content that is formatted according to the mobile design element to the mobile wireless client device. Claims 26, 31, and 36 include similar features, among other things.

The Examiner apparently, analogizes a profile information script described by Sone to the mobile design element. See the 8/26/2005 Office Action at pages 4 and 5. However, in the system of Sone, the profile information script is converted to profile codes, which are used by a data presentation and selection circuit to access a suitable customer data set from a plurality of customer data sets (element 46 in FIGS. 4a and 5a). See Sone at col. 11, lines 24-27. The suitable customer data set is then transmitted to a display panel, via a wired connection (network bus 16), without receiving any formatting. See Sone at col. 11, lines 33-38. Therefore, Sone does not disclose formatting the content according to the mobile design element and transmitting the content that is formatted according to the mobile design element to the mobile wireless client device.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of independent claims 21, 26, 31, and 36 are improper and should be withdrawn. However, solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, independent claim 21 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, displaying an action menu on the wireless client device and enabling selection of the action from the action menu on the mobile wireless client device. For identical purposes, independent claims 26, 31, and 36 have been amended to include similar subject matter.

In an exemplary embodiment, an action menu may include an action menu for a mail application that may be displayed on a mobile wireless client device. The action menu may include various action options which the user may select. Action options may include multilist, reply, delete, fax, forward, search, mail menu. Other action options may also be implemented. See the Specification at page 18, lines 4-8.

In contrast, Sone appears to disclose an interrogator unit capable of receiving a customer ID from a customer ID card, transmitting the customer ID from the interrogator unit to a desktop computer via a network bus, and transmitting a profile specific data set from the desktop computer to a fixed display panel. See Sone at col. 11, lines 10-39. Therefore, Sone does not disclose displaying an action menu on the wireless client device and enabling selection of the action from the action menu on the mobile wireless client device.

Accordingly, the rejections of independent claims 21, 26, 31, and 36 must be withdrawn. Further, dependent claims 22-25, 27-30, 32-35, and 37-40 depend from corresponding ones of independent claims 21, 26, 31, and 36, and therefore, are allowable based on their dependency, as well as for the features that they add to the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: September 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Sean L. Ingram

Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, Virginia 22102
703-905-2000